

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed January 29, 2009, the new assignee of this application (i.e., Nuance Communications Inc.) respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, amendments have been made in the claims, and each of the rejections set forth in the Office Action has been carefully considered and is addressed below. The claims as presented are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-2 and 4-6 were previously pending in this application. Claim 1 is amended herein. Claims 20-24 are added. No claims are canceled. As a result, claims 1-2, 4-6 and 20-24 are pending for examination, with claims 1 and 20 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0003041 to Moore et al. ("Moore") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,036 to Yu et al. ("Yu"). The Assignee respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for bridging a teleconferencing system and an instant messaging system. The method comprises, *inter alia*, receiving, at a speech processing device, a speech input received by the teleconferencing system from a telephone connected to the teleconferencing system; the speech processing device transcribing the speech input to a first text message; and transmitting the first text message to a plurality of instant messaging devices participating in an instant messaging based conference managed by the instant messaging system.

The Office Action contends that Moore satisfies these limitations of claim 1. This contention is unsupported by the reference, as Moore says nothing about transmitting a text message, transcribed from speech input received by a teleconferencing system from a telephone, to a plurality of instant messaging devices. Rather, in the system of Moore, any text message that is transcribed from speech input is sent only to a single instant messaging device (i.e., chat client 14 (FIG. 1)).

The system shown in FIG. 1 of Moore enables a service provider system 30 to make certain services (e.g., directory assistance) available via instant messaging, so that information is provided to a user in text form rather than speech form, thereby allowing the user to copy and paste the information into another application (Abstract, ¶¶[0022], [0024]). The chat client 14 on data processing system 12 allows a “principal” (i.e., a user, software program or combination thereof) to communicate with one or more other “principals” (¶¶[0074]–[0075]). In particular, chat client 14 presents a user interface that allows the principal to initiate an instant messaging session with an entity associated with service provider system 30 (¶¶[0079]–[0081]). Service provider system 30 includes a session router 32 that directs requests for instant messaging sessions to one or more operators or automated stations 142 (¶¶[0091], [0132]).

The system of Moore also includes an intelligent media translator 70, comprising a text-to-speech module to convert text chat produced by chat client 14 to speech signals, and a speech-to-text module to convert speech received from a telephone to text chat (¶¶[0103]–[0104]). For example, Moore discloses that speech input from a caller using telephone 62 (FIG. 1) may be processed by the speech-to-text module to convert the speech into a text, which is then provided to chat client 14, so that a user of chat client 14 will experience speech input from a party using telephone 62 as chat messages (¶[0105]). In this respect, Moore discloses that text transcribed from speech flows in only one direction in the system of FIG. 1: from gateway 50 to chat client 14 via connection 75, speech-to-text converter 74 and connection 76 (FIG. 1; ¶[0105]).

Moore says nothing about transmitting a text message which is transcribed from speech input *to a plurality of instant messaging devices*, as required by claim 1. Fundamentally, the system of Moore is designed to allow one-to-one communication between chat client 14 and an operator/station 142 within a context management session (see, e.g., ¶[0082]). While Moore also states that a chat request from chat client 14 may be distributed to multiple operators/stations 142 (¶[0132]), and that chat client 14 may join a chat with multiple operators/stations 142 in a chat room (¶¶[0082]–[0083]), Moore says nothing about any communication originating from an operator/station 142 being transmitted to a plurality of instant messaging devices, let alone a text message transcribed from speech input, as recited by claim 1.

Further, while the system of Moore is capable of transcribing speech input into a text message, a text message generated in this manner flows in only one direction in the system of Moore (i.e., from operator/station 142 to chat client 14). As Moore discloses communication flowing in this direction being sent to only a single chat client, Moore does not disclose transmitting speech transcribed into text to a plurality of instant messaging devices, as required by claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over any combination of the asserted references, such that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Moore in view of Yu should be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 20-24 are provided to further define Applicant's contribution to the art.

Independent claim 20 recites a speech processing device comprising at least one processor programmed to, *inter alia*, receive a speech input received by a teleconferencing system from a telephone connected to the teleconferencing system: transcribe the speech input into a first text message, and transmit the first text message to a plurality of instant messaging devices participating in an instant messaging based conference managed by an instant messaging system.

It should be appreciated from the discussion above with reference to claim 1 that the asserted combination fails to satisfy these limitations. Accordingly, claim 20 patentably distinguishes over the prior art of record.

Claims 21-24 depend from claim 20 and patentably distinguish over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. N0484.70559US00.

Dated: April 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
Nuance Communications, Inc.

By 

Richard F. Giunta

Registration No.: 36,149

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

Federal Reserve Plaza

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

617.646.8000